

FIREFIGHTER EMPOWERMENT

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP

BY: Gregory H. Glass
Pacific Grove Fire Department
Pacific Grove, California

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy
as part of the Executive Fire Officer Program.

December 19, 1997

Abstract:

This paper proposes that a “motivation gap” exist in the current Total Quality Leadership (TQL) Theory and training between knowing the importance of intrinsic motivation and how to achieve it in the work place.

The paper discusses the importance of TQL in the fire service and outlines the roll of empowerment in a total quality setting. The works of prominent total quality writers are reviewed, as well as alternative models of empowerment available in current literature. By utilizing the information gathered from the literature review the evaluation method will be used. By analyzing the information, recommendations will be made to narrow the “motivation gap” in a total quality setting. Based on the analysis, this paper concludes that the Thomas and Tymon model of empowerment is currently the best tool available for bridging the “motivation gap” and recommends its inclusion in future fire service total quality training (Thomas and Tymon, 1993).

The primary research question addresses the possibility of a motivation gap in current TQL theory and training. That is, do the quality experts give leaders the motivational tools necessary to generate in their employees desired motivational states such as Pride of Workmanship (Deming, 1992, pg. 76)? Subsidiary research questions cover topics such as defining and discussing the concepts of total quality, empowerment, and intrinsic motivation. Additionally, research will be conducted into the type and scope of motivational models used by the quality experts, as well as alternative models of motivation/empowerment available in current literature. Particular attention will be given to the Thomas and Tymon model. The final subsidiary question examines the ways these models can be used to bridge the motivational gap in fire service TQL theory and training.

Research methodology includes an extensive literature review covering the primary subjects of quality, empowerment and intrinsic motivation as well as the related topics of employee participation, worker involvement and general motivation. Additionally, field interviews were conducted at the National Fire Academy to determine the role of empowerment in the successful implementation of TQL at that facility. By utilizing the information gathered from the interviews and literature reviews the evaluation method will be used. By analyzing this information recommendations will be made available for bridging the “motivation gap” and recommend its inclusion in future fire service total quality training.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	1
Introduction	4
Background and Significance	6
Literature Review	8
Procedures	43
Results	44
Discussion	44
Recommendations	48
References	49

Introduction:

The concept of total quality has become one of the most popular topics in the field of management today. This popularity is driven in part by the demand for the fire service to provide more services and the need for continuous improvement in the face of fewer resources and smaller budgets. The concept of continuous process improvement is at the heart of total quality movement, with emphasis on harnessing and directing all the resources of an organization, including its employees, toward that goal. There are a number of experts whose work provides the foundations for the movement. Anyone interested in the field will quickly become familiar with names such as W. Edwards Deming, Joseph M. Juran, Karou Ishikawa, and Philip B. Crosby. These men and others have penned literally millions of words on the subject, developing and building upon everything from the broad conceptual notions of quality to the nuances of statistical process control. These experts frequently speak to the importance of employee motivation and involvement in a total quality effort, but they do not address specifically how to achieve/nurture it in the workplace. The problem is a “gap” exists in current total quality theory and training between knowing motivation is important and knowing how to achieve it.

The primary research question addresses the possibility of a motivation gap in current TQL theory and training. That is, do the quality experts give leaders the motivational tools necessary to generate in their employees desired motivational states such as Pride of Workmanship (Deming, 1992, pg. 76)? Subsidiary research questions cover topics such as defining and discussing the concepts of total quality, empowerment, and intrinsic motivation. Additionally, research will be conducted into the type and scope of motivational models used by the quality experts, as well as alternative models of motivation/empowerment available in current literature. Particular attention will be given to the Thomas

and Tymon model. The final subsidiary question examines the ways these models can be used to bridge the motivational gap in fire service TQL theory and training.

Research methodology includes an extensive literature review covering the primary subjects of quality, empowerment and intrinsic motivation as well as the related topics of employee participation, worker involvement and general motivation. Additionally, field interviews were conducted at the National Fire Academy to determine the role of empowerment in the successful implementation of TQL at that facility. By utilizing the information gathered from the interviews and literature reviews the evaluation method will be used. By analyzing this information recommendations will be made available for bridging the “motivation gap” and recommend its inclusion in future fire service total quality training.

Background and Significance:

Today's environment of scarce resources, ever-smaller budgets and competition from the private sector is forcing the fire service to reevaluate many of the traditional paradigms of its business. The old philosophy that "quality is too expensive" is being replaced by the notion that "quality is free" and is defined by the customer (Crosby, 1979). Organizations that fail to make the move from a quantity focus to a quality focus simply do not survive those that do flourish. This is equally true in the public sector. During the past decade the fire service has seen a dramatic decrease in fire loss nation wide. This abrupt shift in fire loss has left the fire service groping for missions and finding that the public that we maintain is wants more services with less money and fewer staffed positions. Dan Howard, the Undersecretary of the Navy describes the challenges facing the emergency services in the 1990's.

We have a sense of urgency. If any private sector company were faced with a drop in their bottom line of the sort that we are anticipating over the next five years, they would declare bankruptcy and walk away. What we are looking at in the most rosy of scenarios would amount to catastrophic failure in the private sector (Walton, 1990, pg. 150).

Howard, one the first key proponents of the Navy's quality initiatives, continues:

We have to find a way out of this crisis, and one of those ways is through quality-focused management and stream lining every efficiency we can get from everywhere, because we're not going to get any more money. We're going to get a hell of a lot less. Ten years from today there's no way we can predict where our budgets are going to be, except we can be absolutely sure we're going to be a smaller organization then we are now, with an undiminished mission (Walton, 1990, pg. 151).

Again, Dan Howard addresses the importance of TQL in meeting the up coming challenges.

In this downsizing environment, the choice is clear. We either cling to the old way of doing things until we are driven out of business, or we harness the enormous talent of all our people to create a lean, powerful service for this country's future through total quality leadership, the only way ahead (Howard, 1992, pg. 86).

As a program, TQL addresses the organizational and cultural changes necessary to modernize the approach to quality. It does not, however, specifically address the techniques available for generating in the work force the kind of energy necessary to fuel a long-term continuous process improvement effort. Nor does it provide the leader with a vehicle for managing the motivational aspects of an empowered employee. It is this motivational aspect of total quality, and its importance to the long-term success of TQL that this paper will examine.

This subject relates to the Executive Fire Officer Program's fourth year Executive Leadership Course in unit two, The Management Process and six, Fostering Creativity and Innovation. In this unit two we talk about comparative analysis and identifying subsystems. Both areas of discussions are important if the stumbling blocks to motivation are going to be removed.

Literature Review:

The approach to total quality has been evolving since the early 1980's and has its foundations in the work of W. Edwards Deming. Deming defines quality in terms of both the current and future needs of the customer. His philosophy centers on the concept of continuous process improvement, that is, management's obligation to constantly seek ways to improve the "systems" or "processes" of the organization. A process is defined as any set of conditions, or set of causes, that work together to produce a given result usually a blending of machines, methods, materials, and people (Suarez, 1992).

Deming emphasizes the importance of the last ingredient, people, in the process adding that they are an organization's principal competitive resource. He contends that American management requires a whole new structure, from foundation upward if the problems of low quality, resource waste, and unemployment are to be resolved (Deming, 1986). For Deming, this structure is based primarily on his 14 Points, 7 Deadly Diseases, and a System of Profound Knowledge. In adopting Deming's conceptual framework, the fire service emphasized management's responsibility for instituting a systems approach to continuous process improvement and acknowledged that the involvement of its employees must be an integral part of this effort. Thus, it is argued that the central feature of total quality is continuous process improvement, a systems approach to quality management that features the inputs of the line workers. Central to the concepts of "people value" and involvement is the notion of employee empowerment. The term empowerment is used freely in current management literature, often without clarification of the concepts involved. Literally, the word means, "to give official authority or legal power to" (Webster's, 1984, pg. 408). Thus, in its most basic form, empowerment refers to the giving of power. William Byham uses an entertaining fable to communicate the power of ZAPP! Empowerment and defines it as the "giving of power". Similarly, Kenneth Thomas and Betty Velthouse,

"Postulate that to empower means to give power to" (Thomas, 1990, pg. 666). But what does it really mean to empower an individual or an organization? Despite the proliferation of the word in the organizational sciences, this question has yet to be answered definitively. Thomas and Velthouse speak to this issue; empowerment has become a widely used word within the organizational sciences. At this early stage of its usage, however, empowerment has no agreed upon definition. Rather, the term has been used often loosely; to capture a family of somewhat related meanings. For example, the word has been used to describe a variety of specific interventions, as well as the presumed effects of those interventions on workers. In effect, empowerment has come to reflect two interrelated, yet distinctly different, concepts. The first concept addresses its organizational interventions and the other, less concrete, notion deals with empowerment as a "state of mind" or a "feeling" on the part of those who are empowered. Peter Block touches on this distinction, "What this means is that empowerment is a state of mind as well as a result of position, policies, and practices" (Block, 1987, pg. 68).

For the purposes of this paper, a combination of these two views will be used. On the one hand, empowerment is viewed as the changes made in an organization to move power, knowledge, information, and rewards to the lowest levels (Lawler, 1986, p. 3). These actions include specific organizational changes that management makes to delegate or share power. Empowerment is seen as the psychological effects these changes have on the work force, i.e., the "feelings" associated with being empowered.

Empowerment involves those interventions taken in the organization to increase employee participation and power. The term also encompasses the motivational effects these actions have on the work force. For clarity, I will elaborate on both aspects. Mechanistic Interventions of Empowerment, the first meaning of the term is by far the most common and generally refers to the distribution or

delegation of authority to subordinate personnel-empowerment as delegation. Proponents of this definition believe that employees are empowered through tangible changes in the organization's power structure. These changes are often forwarded under the auspices of an "employee participation program". They contend there is no better way than delegation to promote meaningful participation by employees in the company's operation (Jenks, 1985). Gretchen Spreitzer refers to this view of empowerment as the "relational perspective" and states:

In this perspective, empowerment can be achieved through delegation or sharing of power this perspective has received considerable attention in the literature largely through research on participative management and decision making, employee involvement, delegation, and power distribution (Spreitzer, 1992, pg. 6).

Thomas and Velthouse define these actions as environmental changes that impact the "objective variables in the individual's environment." They provide examples such as leadership style, delegation and job design, and state that "the conventional approach to empowerment has involved interventions that target such variables." These tangible changes in the organization are referred to as the mechanistic interventions of empowerment since they involve specific organizational changes designed to push power, knowledge, etc. down to the line workers. Examples might include delegating authority, establishing autonomous work groups (Process Action Teams, etc.), and providing resources and or information to line workers (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990, pg. 676).

The mechanistic view of empowerment is most frequently discussed in management literature, including total quality literature, and includes specific actions to increase employee participation power in an organization such as the formation of autonomous work teams (e.g. Quality Control Circles) or delegation of authority. Secondly, Motivational Effects of Empowerment, the other aspect of

empowerment addresses the psychological impacts or “feelings” of being empowered, that is, empowerment as motivation.

Spreitzer refers to this as the “psychological perspective” of empowerment and states; the second (psychological) perspective of empowerment has received considerably less attention in the literature. It is more psychological in nature and is viewed as a subjective phenomenon relational (mechanistic) and psychological empowerment is believed to be related because psychological empowerment may be an outcome of relational empowerment (Spreitzer, 1992, pg. 7).

Members of the "empowerment as motivation" school often speak of the “energy” involved in the process or the “energizing” effects it has on the work force. Byham refers to ZAPPI as "a force that energizes people" (Byham, 1988, pg. 34). Thomas and Velthouse elaborate upon their earlier definition by explaining that “power” can have several meanings, in a legal sense, power means authority, so that empowerment can mean authorization. Power also may be used to describe capacity, as in the self-efficacy definition of Conger and Kanungo. However, power also means energy. Thus, to empower also can mean to energize. This latter meaning best captures the present motivational usage of the term (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, pg. 667).

Margot Robinson specifically addresses this concept of empowerment as motivation or energy.

How exactly do you give power to someone? Think about your personal experiences. Maybe you’ve worked in a situation in which you felt you had a vote; people listened to you and gave you credit for being an intelligent, thinking human being. How did you feel in that situation?

You probably felt energized, as if you could make a difference through your work. If so, you have some idea of what it is to be empowered. It follows that a manager's ability to generate

this sort of energy in his/her employees and subsequently tap it for the company's good can and does, have a remarkable effect on the organization's success (Robinson, 1993, pg. 44).

Thomas and Velthouse identified this aspect of empowerment as intrinsic task motivation, that is, motivation that results from rewards obtained directly from the work itself (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, is that motivation stemming from rewards/punishments handed out by others. Lawler elaborates on this distinction, "Intrinsic rewards have to be given to the individual by himself or herself; all the organization can do is set up conditions where this is possible. Extrinsic rewards, such as money and promotion can be formally allocated by an organization. Some authors stress the importance of both types of incentives" (Lawler, 1986, pg. 29).

Lawler states that rewards are important determinate of behavior in organizations. Both intrinsic (internal) and extrinsic (external) rewards can be affected by participative programs. Such intrinsic rewards as feelings of accomplishment and self-worth can be increased as a result of individuals being involved in important work decisions. He continues participation (in goal setting) has the effect of stimulating or creating a connection between a particular level of performance and the reception of intrinsic rewards (Lawler, 1986).

Others believe the reliance on extrinsic rewards to be the bane of Western management, maintaining that intrinsic rewards are potentially much more powerful because they encourage feelings of ownership in the worker. An individual will be committed to the task if they place intrinsic value (i.e., feelings of self-esteem, competence) on the quality of the product.

Manz argues that the goal of empowerment is "self-leadership" and states, the label "self-leadership" has been adopted to connote a process that involves intrinsic motivation and committed to

accomplishing something that is personally relevant, meaningful, and that the individual helped to select and feels some ownership of. On the other hand, an individual driven by extrinsic rewards will only comply with regulations to avoid losing pay, promotion, job security, etc. (Manz, 1991, pg. 18).

Senge denounces the reliance on extrinsic incentives, stating, from an extrinsic perspective, the only way to get continuous improvement is to find ways to continually motivate people to improve, because people only modify their behavior when there is some external motivation to do so. Otherwise, they will just sit there, or worse, slide backwards. This leads to what workers perceive as management continually raising the bar to manipulate more effort from them (Senge, 1992, pg. 32).

Covey agrees, stating, "That focus on golden eggs (extrinsic rewards) that attitude, that paradigm is totally inadequate to tap into the powerful energies of the mind and heart of another person." He continues that by stressing the importance of intrinsic rewards, psychic or psychological consequences include recognition, approval, respect, credibility, or the loss of them. Unless people are in the survival mode, psychic compensation is often more motivating than financial compensation" (Covey, 1989, pg. 59).

Based on this research it is argued the motivational heart of empowerment is intrinsic task activation which is defined as "positively valued experiences that individuals derive directly from a task" (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, pg. 668).

The Thomas and Tymon model of empowerment identifies a number of actions designed to increase this aspect of empowerment. It providing managers with the "building blocks" and "team actions" necessary to foster what they identify as the four elements of intrinsic task motivation-choice, competence, meaningfulness, and progress (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

The topics discussed in this paper are certainly not new to the field of management science. In fact, a considerable amount of resource data is available on empowerment, total quality and intrinsic motivation, only a few however address how they are related. A prominent quality expert, Karou Ishikawa advocated the necessity of an empowered work force in a total quality setting when he emphasized involvement of the entire organization in the quest for total quality. He postulated that there was not enough reliance on inputs to quality from non-specialists (line-workers) in the United States. Ishikawa credited the relative successes of the Japanese quality effort compared to those of Western industry to the total commitment to quality of all employees, not just a few staff specialists or consultants. He called this concept company wide quality control (CWQC) (Ishikawa, 1985).

Current research indicates that the concepts of employee empowerment or involvement and total quality exist simultaneously to one degree or another in many U.S. companies today. One such study, conducted by Dr. Edward Lawler, specifically addresses this issue.

Lawler's Survey

Edward Lawler studied the relationship between these two ideas through a series of surveys using inputs from many of the current Fortune 1000 businesses. He concluded, “there is a close relationship between Total Quality Management programs and employee involvement programs” (Lawler, 1992, pg. xvi). It should be noted that Lawler's notion of employee involvement is very similar to the concept of employee empowerment as defined in this study. While some conceptual differences do exist, particularly in relation to the latter emphasis on intrinsic motivation, the results of his survey nevertheless are informative. His findings illustrate the emphasis placed on both concepts by today's leading businesses, as well as the way that the top managers of those organizations view the relationship between the two in the context of the company as a whole.

The results reported below are adapted from Lawler's 1990 follow up survey of 313 Fortune 1000 companies, approximately 50% were from the service sector and 50% from the manufacturing sector. Their median size was between 9,000 and 10,000 employees and in just over half the cases (55%), managers responsible for personnel and human resources gave responses to the survey. The remainder of the questionnaires were completed by other senior executives in the organization (Lawler, 1992, pg. 4).

The purpose of Lawler's study was to determine how employee involvement and total quality management is related in companies that have used them both. He specifically asked the participants three questions on the subject.

1. Which of the two programs started first?
2. How are the programs managed?
3. How does management view these concepts?

The first question addressed the issue of chronological order. Results are contained in Figure 1. The preponderance of responses indicating that employee involvement started first can be credited to the fact that it was popularized early in the United States.

What Started First?

Involvement First	54.00%
Simultaneously	18.00%
Quality First	28.00%

Figure 1 - Relationship of Employee Involvement to Total Quality

In contrast total quality is a relatively recent phenomenon in American business circles. Lawler states, "Early employee involvement, often entailing the establishment of quality circles and other participation groups (mechanistic interventions), can set the stage for the systematization of these efforts through a total quality program" (Lawler, 1992, pg. 103).

The second question addressed the way that America's leading companies managed their involvement and quality programs. Results were much less definitive in this case (see Figure 2). Lawler notes that this is a critical issue in the success of the respective programs. He contends that, "having two approaches with different names may set the stage for competing programs in an organization" (Lawler, 1992, pg. 103).

How Are They Managed?

Coordinated	32.00%
Separate Programs	32.00%
Single Program	36.00%

Figure 2 - Relationship of Employee Involvement to Total Quality

Finally, Lawler asked managers how they viewed the relationship between employee involvement and total quality, essentially, which effort predominates? The results indicated that a clear majority of managers believe that total quality encompasses involvement (see Figure 3). It is here that Lawler's study has the most relevance for this study. The results obtained in response to this question imply that American managers assume that the organizational changes induced by a total quality program will result in an "involved" work force. Lawler voices this assumption, "Total Quality Management programs often establish quality circles and other participative groups, sometimes called quality-

improvement teams, that are clearly a way of creating involvement and sharing power" (Lawler, 1992, pg. 103).

Image of Relationship?

Involvement Part of TQ	76.00%
TQ Part of Involvement	24.00%

Figure 3 - Relationship of Employee Involvement to Total Quality

This supposition, which ignores the motivational aspects of an “empowered” vice an “involved” work force, plants the seeds for the eventual failure of most quality programs. Again, managers seem more comfortable dealing with the actions of their employees rather than their feelings. Lawler identifies this possibility of total quality management may also be an easier concept to rally managers around, since on the surface it emphasizes work processes rather than issues of power and management style (Lawler, 1992).

Deming addresses this topic at length, stating, "In my experience, people can face almost any problem except the problems of people. They can work long hours, face declining business, face loss of jobs, but not the problems of people" (Deming, 1986, pg. 85).

In fact, Deming refers to the establishment of Quality Control Circles and so-called “employee involvement” programs as “instant pudding” and “a lazy way out”. He continues,

Faced with the problems of people, management, in my experience, go into a state of paralysis, taking refuge in formation of QC-circles and groups for EI, EP, and QWL (Employee Involvement, Employee Participation, and Quality of work Life). These groups predictably disintegrate within a few, months from frustration, finding themselves parties to a cruel hoax,

unable to accomplish anything, for the simple reason that no one in management will take action on suggestions for improvement (Deming, 1980, p. 85).

Lawler summarizes the findings of his study by stating, "Employee involvement may be viewed as creating the organizational context needed to support quality improvement processes" (Lawler, 1992, pg. 105). Here he clearly delineates between his notion of involvement and the motivational effects associated with the term empowerment. He emphasizes the fact that involvement primarily affects the organizational context or structure, a result this paper attributes to the mechanistic focus of current empowerment interventions. Equally important, however, are the psychological effects these interventions have on the work force, a distinction often overlooked by management (Lawler, 1992).

Peter Block discusses the reservations that American managers have regarding the concept of managing "feelings". He refers to this as the "denial of self-expression" (Block, 1987, pg. 27). The notion of empowerment as motivation, specifically intrinsic motivation, is much more difficult for managers to grasp than a simple change to an organizational chart or policy letter. Consequently, it is more likely to be excluded from any formal attempts to empower the work force. This exclusion is often due to management's lack of training in the behavioral sciences, coupled with a reliance on the scientific management techniques conceived during the early part of this century. Another possible reason that American managers tend to shy away from this aspect of empowerment is our cultural norm that insists that work is no place to discuss "feelings."

Block states, "There is a strong belief in organizations that we need to exercise self-control as well as to submit to the authority of those above us. When we are asked how we feel about something, the answer is who cares? We're here to get the job done; we're here to be rational and logical and to get on with the business at hand. This is no place to talk about feelings" (Block, 1987, pg. 27).

He goes on to identify a phrase that many of us have undoubtedly heard before, "In fact, one of the strongest terms of contempt is to say to somebody, let's not get into that touchy/feely stuff" (Block, 1987, pg. 28). He further discusses the ramifications of denying the "feelings" aspect of empowerment, which we pay a high price when we deny self-expression. All managers are constantly looking for ways to motivate and energize the people working for them. The source of all energy, passion, motivation, and an internally generated desire to do good work is our own feeling about what we are doing. To deny self-expression and ask people to exercise self-control and to behave themselves is to put a damper on their level of motivation and energy (Block, 1987).

Along the many changes brought about by today's dynamic, competitive business environment, however, is the shifting of this cultural norm to one that says that it is acceptable, and often imperative to manage employee feelings as well as actions. The Thomas and Tymon empowerment model facilitates this change, providing managers with practical guidance on translating complicated theories of human motivation (e.g. Deci, Maslow) into pragmatic, hands-on applications that have relevance on the shop floor. More specifically, the Thomas and Tymon model provides the tools necessary to manage the feelings of an empowered work force and emphasizes the role of intrinsic task motivation in the process (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

Deming also emphasizes intrinsic motivation, stating, "The possibility of pride of workmanship (intrinsic motivation) means more to the production worker than gymnasiums, tennis courts, and recreation areas" (Deming, 1986, pg. 85).

Lawler argues that effective involvement/empowerment interventions foster high level of intrinsic motivation in the work force and result in better quality. He states, "It (intrinsic motivation) is high because people feel responsible for how well the work is performed. As a result, they become

intrinsically motivated to perform it well, quality is the key here; people become motivated to do high quality work. They want to be associated with a high-quality product because it satisfies their needs for competence and self-esteem" (Lawler, 1986, pg. 31).

Senge also ties together the concepts of intrinsic motivation and quality, stating, "Intrinsic motivation lies at the heart of Deming's management philosophy corporate commitment to quality that is not based on intrinsic motivation is a house built on sand." He further postulates, from an intrinsic perspective, there is nothing mysterious at all about continuous improvement. If left to their own devices people will naturally look for ways to do things better, what they need is adequate information and appropriate tools (Senge, 1992, pg. 32).

Thus, it is argued that empowerment as intrinsic motivation provides the energy necessary for success in a quality effort, while TQM provides a way of harnessing this energy for continuous improvement. It is the motivational aspect of empowerment and its ability to energize the work force that enables managers to harness and direct an otherwise untapped energy source, employee power toward the goal of continuous improvement.

The role of empowerment, specifically empowerment as motivation, in a total quality setting is to generate the energy necessary to fuel the continuous improvement process central to total quality. Byham identifies this relationship; "More and more in years to come, the successful organizations will be the ones best able to apply the creative energy of individuals toward constant improvement. Yet, constant improvement is a value that cannot be imposed upon people. It has to come from the individual. The only way to get people to adopt constant improvement as a way of life in doing daily business is by empowering them" (Byham, 1985, pg. viii).

Dveirin and Adams discuss in detail this aspect of empowerment in health care settings, stating, "The shift from compliance to continuous improvement requires a bridge empowerment by which all employees can contribute their intelligence, knowledge, and experience in the service of full circle thinking" (Dveirin and Adams, 1993, pg. 222).

Total quality leadership provides for many of the mechanistic interventions of empowerment, including the formation of Quality Management Boards and Process Action Teams. It does not, however, provide a vehicle for managing the "feelings" of an empowered work force or for generating the kind of energy required for long-term success of the program; hence, the "motivation gap." The bridge from compliance to continuous improvement will only be completed when managers' employ the interventions associated with empowerment as motivation, that is actions designed to enhance a worker's intrinsic desire to produce a quality product or service. Examples of this wider category of interventions would include the use of visionary leadership, e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985, Block. 1987; Nanus, 1992, and the nurturing of trust and self-esteem (e.g., Bennis. 1989; Covey. 1989; Deming, 1986; Lawler. 1986; Byham, 1988). Based on the information contained here it is concluded, to be successful in the long run, the philosophy of total quality specifically total quality leadership, requires managers employ more than just the mechanistic interventions of empowerment. They must also employ other types of actions to effectively manage the intrinsic motivation (energy) of the work force.

It is the concept of empowerment as intrinsic motivation as embodied by the Thomas & Tymon model of empowerment, that will be used to manage the "feelings" of an empowered work force and thus bridge the gap in TQL theory and training (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

The quality experts frequently speak to the importance of employee motivation and involvement in a total quality effort. None, however, address specifically how to achieve it in the work place.

Generally, they content themselves with the assumption that employees are self-motivating and management needs only remove various “barriers” to see that motivation realized. This section will discuss the findings of the literature review on this subject, examining the work of three of the most prominent writers in the quality field, Phillip Crosby, Joseph Juran, and I Edwards Deming.

Crosby on Motivation

Of the three quality experts being discussed, Crosby spends the least amount of time on the subject of motivation. He does, however, speak of demotivation, that is, the notion that all workers are originally motivated but eventually become disenchanted due to failures in the organization. He states, we must ask ourselves, “Why do we need a special program to motivate our people? Didn't we hire motivated employees? They were well motivated when they came to work. That first day, when they reported in, there was nothing but smiles, everything was positive” (Crosby, 1984, pg. 34). He continues, however, a few months or years later things are different. The employee is not at all thrilled with the company and the job. Employees are turned off to the company through the normal operating practices of the organization. The thoughtless, irritating, unconcerned way they are dealt with is what does it. They feel they are pawns in the hands of uncaring functional operations (Crosby, 1994).

Crosby identifies several examples of this treatment, focusing on one way performance reviews, unfair expense account practices, and a “meeting culture” dominated by senior members. He concludes, “Being an employee in a hassling company is a lot like living at home after you grow up and having your parents decide all kinds of things for you” (Crosby, 1984, pg. 19).

Juran on Motivation

Juran devotes a considerable amount of time to the topic of motivation. Most of this time, however, is spent simply outlining the prominent theories of motivation conceived by clinical

psychologists and behavioral scientists. He discusses at length the theories of several of these motivation experts, including Maslow (1954), Herzberg (1959), McGregor (1960), and Hackman and Oldham (1980). His discussion of Frederick Herzberg's work is particularly relevant to this study.

Herzberg draws the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, calling the extrinsic category of incentives hygiene factors (or dissatisfiers). He contends that, after a certain point, providing more of these factors will only prevent worker dissatisfaction rather than motivate the work force. In order to truly motivate employees, Herzberg believes that management must use incentives that are intrinsic to the job itself, or motivators. These motivators, such as achievement, recognition, and responsibility will result in organizational, "wellness" (Herzberg, 1959).

By identifying the merits of Herzberg's work Juran demonstrates his belief in the power of intrinsic motivation. He fails, however, to provide further guidance on his views regarding the nurturing of this type of motivation in the work force. Fittingly he closes his discussion on the theories of motivation by stating, "Unfortunately, the behavioral scientists have not translated their findings fully into the manager's dialect" (Juran, 1964, pg. 142).

Like Deming, Juran speaks of the "Pride of Workmanship" inside each employee to do quality work. He implies that workers are self-motivating with respect to quality; the problem lies not with the worker but with management. American management, he believes, relies too heavily on the standardized, inflexible principles of management espoused by Frederick Taylor in his work the principles of scientific management. Juran states, "Taylor's major premise lack of worker education has been made obsolete by the remarkable rise in education levels. As a consequence the major underemployed asset in the United States is the education, experience, and creativity of the work force" (Juran, 1980, pg. 153).

Juran sums up his thoughts on motivation by stating, “Managers are unified in their belief that motivation is vital, but they are divided on how to achieve it” (Juran, 1970, pg. 110).

Deming on Motivation

Deming emphasizes the importance of a worker's intrinsic motivation in the total quality process, often referring to it in general terms as “Pride of workmanship” (Deming, 1986, pg. 76) or “Joy in Work” (Aguayo, 1990, pg. 181). Christy states, “It would seem clear that his (Deming's) phrase “Pride of Workmanship” relates to a worker's intrinsic motivation to produce quality work” (Christy, 1992, pg. 17).

Aguayo adds, “In the Deming view, intrinsic motivation is the engine for improvement” (Aguayo, 1990, pg. 103). Like the other quality experts, Deming contends that workers are inherently motivated to do quality work. He states, “Talk about motivation people are motivated. All people are motivated” (Walton, 1990, pg. 83).

In conjunction with his emphasis on intrinsic motivation Deming strongly discourages the use of extrinsic motivators on the work force. He credits the use of external (extrinsic) rewards, such as ranked performance appraisals, as the main source of “fear” in the work place (Deming, 1986). He adds, “Management that denies to their employees dignity and self-esteem will smother intrinsic motivation” (Deming, 1990, pg. 13). This circumstance, he believes, results from management’s reliance on external rewards. He continues, “some extrinsic motivators rob employees of dignity and self-esteem” (Deming, 1990, pg. 14). Deming's Point 12 urges managers to remove the “barriers” to intrinsic motivation and end this reliance on extrinsic motivation. Christy elaborates, “foremost is Deming's admonition to remove the barriers that rob people of Pride of Workmanship, his Point 12. These “barriers” that Deming mentions involve external (extrinsic) rewards and punishments. Deming

asserts that these external rewards and punishments stifle or kill a worker's intrinsic motivation by causing him to focus on the external incentives such as piecework pay, incentive pay, quotas, punishment, instead of experiencing the intrinsic rewards of the task, or Pride in Workmanship (Christy, 1992, pg. 22).

Deming's beliefs on motivation as discussed above, are clear. First, all workers are inherently motivated to do quality work, (i.e., "Pride {Joy} of Workmanship"). Second, management's job is to remove the "barriers" to this intrinsic motivation, thus fueling the engine for improvement, and third, the reliance on external (extrinsic) rewards is the main "barrier" to worker motivation.

A common theme in the quality expert's theories on motivation is the belief that all workers are inherently motivated to do quality work. Additionally, this inherent (intrinsic) motivation is universally identified as the key to total quality. Two of the three experts discussed here, Juran and Deming, explicitly refer to this intrinsic motivation as "Pride of Workmanship" or "Joy in Work." They assert that management need only remove the "barriers" to intrinsic motivation in the work place and good things (quality, productivity, etc.) will follow. These "barriers" include the use of performance ratings, quotas, piecework pay, and other external rewards.

Despite the unanimity as to the importance of intrinsic motivation in a total quality setting, none of the experts provide guidance on how to enhance or manage it in the work place. Nor do they suggest how to tap into it as a source of continuous improvement. Thus, it is concluded, the quality experts unanimously agree on the importance of intrinsic motivation and involvement in a total quality effort, but they do not address specifically how to achieve/nurture it in the workplace.

Lawler on Empowerment

Edward E. Lawler III, is a research professor and professor of management at the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Southern California. His educational background is in psychology (Ph.D., Berkeley, 1964) and his practical experience involves work as a management consultant on the topics of employee involvement, organizational change, and compensation. He has published extensively on these subjects, authoring many popular books and papers including his most prominent book, *High-Involvement Management* (1986). In that work, Lawler introduces the concept of employee involvement as a management strategy. As stated earlier, his notion of employee involvement is very similar to the concept of employee empowerment as defined in this study, although he is conceptually less focused on intrinsic motivation. Lawler argues that today's business environment requires a shift from the traditional bureaucratic style of management to one that encourages employee participation and involvement. He states, "The societal, business, product and work force changes that have occurred argue strongly for a change in management style. Clearly, American organizations need to be more effective simply to be competitive and not just somewhat more effective, but dramatically better" (Lawler, 1986, pg. 19). He continues, "It is unlikely that dramatic improvements can come about through the use of traditional management approaches. Participative management makes the most sense because it fits well with the major changes. Participative management suits the current work force, technologies, and societal conditions better than any other alternative" (Lawler, 1986, pg. 20).

Lawler believes that there are many techniques or "programs" that can be used to implement to one degree or another this new management style, labeled participative management. His book includes separate chapters on many of the structural approaches to employee involvement including quality circles, employee surveys, job enrichment programs, work teams, and gain sharing. He states, "participation is not something that organizations either have or do not have - it comes in many forms

and can be brought about in many ways” (Lawler, 1986, pg. 22). He does not, however, address specific techniques for improving worker intrinsic motivation other than to acknowledge that it exists and is important.

Central to Lawler's model is the belief that the effectiveness of these disparate programs can be measured by the degree to which they push downward in the organization the four keys to participation information, knowledge, rewards, and power. He states, "These different programs all move one or more of the following further down in the organization, information, knowledge, rewards and power. This has the effect of allowing more people to participate in important decisions and activities, and because of this, these programs are often collectively referred to as participative approaches to management" (Lawler, 1986, pg. 3). He summarizes by providing managers with a list of leadership skills necessary to effectively manage a participative work force, stating “overall, managers in high involvement organizations need a particular set of leadership skills that will allow them to do four critical things for the organization. These leadership skills he contends, include: (1) building trust and openness, (2) providing a vision and communicating it, (3) moving decisions to the proper location, and (4) empowering others" (Lawler, 1986, pg. 211).

Block on Empowerment

Peter Block’s expertise lies in his vast experience (25+ years) as an organizational development consultant. His educational background is in organizational behavior (M.A., Yale). Block’s work, *The Empowered Manager* (1987) is the culmination of his efforts since the mid-sixties to foster the concept of employee empowerment in his client.

Block uses the term empowerment to represent the use of positive politics in the organizational environment. He states, “Politics is the exchange of power and so goes hand in hand with

empowerment” (Block, 1987, pg. xviii). He argues that bureaucratic organizations foster negative politics, which he defines as actions that are in the service of our own self-interest. To be political is to be self-serving on behalf of our own career. Positive Politics, on the other hand, represents the notion that people can have self interests that factor in the well being of the entire organization and pursue those interests without manipulation or deceit (Block, 1987).

Block contends that empowerment is the only way for an organization to break out of the bureaucratic cycle. He states, “the way through this dilemma is to act in a way that serves our empowerment” (Block, 1987, pg. 69). He continues, empowerment stems from two sources, (1) the structure, practices and policies we support as managers who have control over others and (2) the personal choices we make that are expressed by our own actions (Block, 1987).

Management’s role in the process is to “empower ourselves and to create conditions under which others can do the same” (Block, 1987, pg. 70). Like Lawler, Block designs the majority of his action sequences to affect the organization as a whole rather than the individual employee. His suggestions include (1) “flattening out” the organizational hierarchy, (2) changing company supervisory policies, and (3) reversing the performance appraisal process intrinsic motivation (Block, 1987).

Block indirectly addresses the importance of intrinsic motivation when he defines the concept of “enlightened self interest”. A person with an enlightened self-interest does not pursue the traditional goals of pay and advancement (myopic self-interest); instead they internalize the value of their job by pursuing “mastery, meaning contribution, integrity and service” (Block, 1987, pg.93). He states, "If I define self-interest only as those things that win the approval or are under the control of other people, I am dictating a dependent life style for myself. Contribution, service, meaning, integrity, and touching other people in a positive way are all things I can do on my own" (Block, 1987, pg. 21).

Additionally, Block touches on intrinsic motivation in his statement, "The only justification for taking a risk and creating an organization of your own choosing is to do it out of a commitment to something you believe in. In a sense, something that you have to do. The "have to do" comes from inside, not outside" (Block, 1987, pg. 82).

Management's role in this process is to create an organizational environment that values autonomy, encouraging workers to choose their own course and commit themselves to its success. Block suggests that, as managers we can encourage this behavior by "acting in ways that give others ownership" and "creating a vision of greatness for ourselves and asking our subordinates to do the same" (Block, 1987, pg. 83). Block's work, though conceptually powerful, stops short of providing the manager on the line with an explicit set of actions that he/she can use to foster individual empowerment in the work force.

Based upon the information contained in this section regarding the "general" models of empowerment it is concluded, though conceptually strong the "general" models of empowerment do not provide the typical line manager with the practical tools or direction necessary to empower their employees.

At the other end of the spectrum from the "general" models of empowerment are a number of works that provide line managers with a detailed list of actions necessary to empower the work force. Their authors usually have a great deal of experience in their particular line of work but little formal education in organizational dynamics or psychology. Consequently, these "specific" models of empowerment tend to be conceptually vague, particularly on the notion of empowerment as motivation. Essentially, these works provide a detailed direction on how to get there from here, but fail to explain

exactly what or where "there" is. While many examples of this type of model exist, this study will focus on the works of Christopher Altizer (1993) and Gordon Dveirin with Kenneth Adams (1993).

Altizer's Model of Empowerment

Christopher C. Altizer is a Training Development Manager for the Allstate Insurance Company. In his article, Four Steps to Empowerment, he describes the four "tactics of empowerment" used in his company (Altizer, 1993, pg. 21). He begins his article by describing the importance of empowerment in a total quality setting stating, empowerment and total quality management, two business crazes of the early 90's, are proving to be strategies that can improve customer satisfaction, reduce process costs and improve employee development and retention. The trick seems to be linking the two and understanding employee empowerment as more than a "nice to do" (Altizer, 1993).

Altizer goes on to state that empowering employees involves much more than telling them they are” and outlines what he believes to be the four steps to empowerment. These are (1) reviewing employee authority levels, (2) delegating authority, (3) encouraging innovation, and (4) recognizing and rewarding empowered behavior. These steps are summarized below.

In the first step, Review Employee Authority Levels, Altizer contends that the tight procedural controls present in most organizations are only necessary when employees are inexperienced or undereducated. However, as organizations, “flatten” to meet today's business challenges, limiting the authority and creativity of the work force is a grave mistake. He states, "In the flattened 90's, employees tend to be longer tenured, therefore more experienced. The empowering manager makes the most of that experience" (Altizer, 1993, p. 21). He continues, "authority limits serve a useful purpose, but when the circumstances that precipitated their use have changed, the empowering manager removes them for three reasons. (1) To allow employees the freedom to meet customer requirements,

(2) to fully develop employee skills and (3) to demonstrate the deepening trust in employee abilities" (Altizer, 1993, pg. 21).

The second step to empowerment is Delegate, Delegate, Delegate. Here, Altizer stresses management's responsibility in allowing employees to provide solutions to the process problems they identify during the course of continuous improvement. He states, "The empowering manager provides parameters and solution resources, but requires employees to solve the problems" (Altizer, 1993, pg. 21).

Altizer's third step to empowerment is Encourage Innovation. He states that employee initiative and innovation are essential to quality improvement" and argues that managing "by the rules" or "by the book" only serves to inhibit this initiative to the detriment of process improvement. He goes on by stating that the empowering manager allows employees to build on past lessons to make process changes, and redefines "risk-taking" as a virtue rather than a vice empowerment sometimes involves encouraging innovation and initiative for its own sake (Altizer, 1993, pg. 22). In this environment managers should encourage risk taking in their employees by rewarding them when they succeed and not punishing them when they fail.

The final step to empowerment is Recognize and Reward Empowered Actions. Altizer contends that the ultimate goal of an empowering rewards system is to encourage empowered actions by demonstrating this is (now) how it's done around here" (Altizer, 1993, pg. 22). He states, "Once empowered actions are understood to be "how it's done around here," managers can begin the shift from rewarding to expecting those actions. To effect this change, management must reward actions that are demonstrative of an empowered work force." He continues, "The empowered manager recognizes and rewards desired actions with public praise, letters, or just by getting out of the way" (Altizer, 1993).

In summary, Altizer provides line managers with a number of deliberate steps designed to foster employee empowerment in the work place. He concludes his article by restating the importance of his notion of empowerment, “continuous improvement requires knowledgeable, capable employees who have the power to examine the status quo and make changes” (Altizer, 1993, pg. 23). He does not, however, delve into the conceptual foundations of the term as defined in current literature. In effect, this omission leaves the reader with a precise set of directions but little concept of the ultimate destination.

The Change Navigators' Model of Empowerment

Gordon P. Dveirin and Kenneth L. Adams are both high ranking members of the organizational effectiveness consulting company known as Change Navigators, Inc. Their article Empowering Health Care Improvement, An operational Model, provides the second “specific” model of empowerment. In it they contend that the shift from traditional, bureaucratic styles of management to a style that fosters continuous improvement is fueled by the creative energy of an empowered work force. “A key role of leadership” they argue “is to help create this empowering environment” (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 224).

Dveirin and Adams further distinguish between the traditional management style which is characterized by compliance, and the new style characterized by empowerment. They state the distinction between compliance and empowerment lies in the locus of control. Compliance suggests standards and levels of authority that lie outside and above those who must act. The idea of “empowerment” suggests that those who act own the standards, and the authority to reach and exceed them.

To effect this change from compliance to empowerment, Dveirin and Adams present a model for empowerment that “can serve as a template for leadership actions that promote empowerment.” They call their work the Nine Aspects of Empowerment and briefly capsulize each aspect in the article.

Their first aspect of empowerment centers on the establishment of an organizational mission and vision. The authors assert that top management cannot simply dictate this vision and expect commitment. Instead, the vision must be established with input from the entire organization; it is “not handed down from above; rather, it arises out of the alignment created by repeated dialogue among all stakeholders involved” (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg 230). They continue, “With a mission and vision, people can make real-time decisions that are aligned with both the organization's and their own needs” (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 226). This is similar to the importance of goal congruence expressed by Block; employees with enlightened self-interests set goals that champion both personal and organizational causes (Block, 1987).

The second aspect of empowerment gives workers authority and permission to use it. Here, management demonstrates its respect for the intelligence of the work force by allowing them “a scope of authority and responsibility that is ample and sufficient for what is expected of them” (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 226). In doing so, the organization benefits from the resourcefulness and ingenuity of their human resources. The authors state that in today's work force the typical employee is intelligent and capable. In order for the organization to benefit from all the knowledge skill and capacity for intelligent action that employees have to offer, their employees' judgment and capabilities must be respected (Dveirin & Adams, 1993).

Next, employees in empowered organizations are given control over resources. Dveirin and Adams state, “When every expenditure on a project must be scrutinized, people are not empowered.”

Instead, they argue, "Each individual or group needs a clearly established level of resource control commensurate with their authority and scope of responsibility" (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 226).

The fourth aspect of empowerment identified in this model centers on the need for direct feedback to employees from customers, suppliers, etc. This access to information is crucial if the work force is to make intelligent, informed decisions within their scope of authority. The authors contend that empowered employees receive meaningful feedback from all their stakeholders, the people or groups with whom they must build a relationship if they are to accomplish their mission successfully (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 226).

The fifth aspect of empowerment is access to education and training. Just as employees require timely feedback from stakeholders to make intelligent decisions, they also need proper education and training in the myriad of technical and interpersonal skills required of an empowered work force. According to this model, management's responsibility is to provide that training. Dveirin and Adams state, "An empowering environment provides easy access to continuous learning opportunities through which people can get whatever kinds of development they need when they need it and in a form they can use" (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 227).

Another aspect of empowerment revolves around management's ability to create an environment of trust and respect. This is a very important aspect of empowered organizations. The author states, "An empowering atmosphere recognizes the inherent maturity of most adults and their ability to manage their affairs appropriately. Given skills, resources, training, a clear mission, vision, and leadership's respect, they will do a good job" (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 227).

The next aspect of empowerment, according to Dveirin and Adams, is the creation in the organization of appropriate avenues of influence. They state, "These avenues reflect any organizational

mechanisms that enhance the employee's ability to communicate their particular expertise into the larger system and subsequently to view evidence that the system benefits from changes and makes use of their input" (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 227).

The eighth aspect of empowerment deals with the use of meaningful incentives to encourage empowered behavior. The authors argue that if the rate of pay, bonuses, and recognition are virtually independent of their accomplishments or level of effort, people do not feel empowered (Dveirin & Adams, 1993).

The ninth and final aspect of empowerment listed by the authors provides for the establishment of clear boundaries within which employees are free to exercise autonomy. The authors state that within these jointly established boundaries, employees must feel free to manage resources, manage their time, make decisions, and have jurisdiction over a clear area of responsibility and accountability (Dveirin & Adams, 1993).

In summary, the operational model of empowerment proposed by Dveirin and Adams provides line managers with a detailed list of what are in their opinion, the critical aspects of an empowered work place. These aspects, they explain, must all be present if an organization is to realize the full benefits of empowered employees. They state, "Given the multifaceted nature of the empowerment model, some may wonder where to begin to focus leadership efforts. It is important to emphasize that the constellation of empowerment aspects composes an integral system, the full potential for empowerment arises from synergy among all nine aspects" (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 230).

In this fashion they argue, like Lawler, that to exclude even one aspect could result in only a fraction of the potential for empowerment being realized. Like the other specific models of empowerment, this work provides managers with detailed instructions on how to empower employees,

but little guidance on exactly what empowerment is. The authors are action specific but conceptually vague, stating only that, “The term empowerment emerged only after we identified a constellation of behaviors resulting from a recognizable form of organizational environment” (Dveirin & Adams, 1993, pg. 224).

Conclusion

Based upon the information continued in this section regarding the "specific" models of empowerment, it is concluded, that unlike the "general" models of empowerment the "specific" models provide line managers with a detailed list of actions necessary to empower their employees. However, these models tend to be vague in their attempts to define the concepts behind the term empowerment and its motivational implications in the work place.

The above information examines the quality expert's views on motivation, revealing that they all stress the importance of intrinsic motivation to some degree. Deming places particular emphasis on the link between quality and intrinsic motivation; he contends that management need only remove the barriers to "Pride of Workmanship" or “Joy in Work,” his equivalent to intrinsic motivation, and total quality will follow. Unfortunately, none of the quality experts provide specific guidance on how to foster intrinsic motivation in the work force, hence the “motivation gap”.

Also included is an examination of several of the alternative models of empowerment available in current literature. These models are categorized as either “general” or “specific” depending upon the author's approach to the subject. The “general” models of empowerment, though conceptually strong, do not provide the typical line manager with the practical tools or direction necessary to empower his/her employees. In Juran's terms, “the behavioral scientists have not translated their findings fully into the manager's dialect” (Juran, 1964, pg. 142). On the other hand, the specific models of empowerment

do provide the individual manager with a detailed list of actions to achieve empowerment, however, they fail to explain exactly what the term means or how it relates to desired worker behaviors.

These “specific” works can be likened to providing a traveler with several unique lists of detailed instructions but not providing him with a clear description of his destination or, more importantly, with a map with which to integrate the different lists. The “general” models of empowerment describe in great detail the traveler's destination but do not provide him with practical directions on how to get there.

What the traveler (line manager) needs is a tool that combines the conceptual foundations of a “general” model with the detailed directions of a “specific” model. In effect, this tool would provide our travelers with the “map” necessary to guide them from their unique points of origin to a common destination an empowered work force. This map would also provide a means of reconciling and integrating the different sets of directions that the “specific” models invariably produce. Thus it is concluded that the individual line manager needs a tool that combines the strong conceptual foundation of a “general” empowerment model with the detailed actions of a “specific” model.

Based upon the research conducted in conjunction with the drafting of this research paper, the Thomas and Tymon model of Empowerment, outlined on the following pages, does the best job of reconciling this difference between the two disparate categories of empowerment models. It provides the line manager with a set of tools that are both conceptually strong and detailed enough to be practical. Additionally, the Thomas and Tymon model bridges the motivation gaps in TQL theory and training by providing managers with a means of fostering intrinsic motivation in the work force (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

The Thomas and Tymon Model of Empowerment

A. INTRODUCTION

From the individual manager's perspective the Thomas and Tymon model of empowerment appears to be the most effective tool currently available for fostering an empowered work force. It combines a strong theoretical foundation, empowerment as intrinsic motivation, with a set of specific action recommendations, thus giving the line manager a practical, conceptually focused tool for creating empowerment.

B. Background: The Thomas/Velthouse Cognitive Model

The Thomas and Tymon model builds upon the earlier work of Thomas and Velthouse who define empowerment in terms of intrinsic motivation. Thomas and Velthouse argue that the intrinsic rewards derived from a task result not only from the successful performance of task activities, but also from a meaningful task purpose. Here the authors distinguish their model from previous works on the subject (Deci, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 1985) by defining “task” in terms of activities and the rationale for those activities. They state, “task refers to a set of activities directed toward a purpose. Thus, a task includes both activities and a purpose” (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, pg. 668).

Central to the Thomas and Velthouse model is the identification of task assessments. Essentially, task assessments are the individual's cognition (judgments) regarding the task they are performing. The authors state that intrinsic task motivation involves that generic cognition by an individual, pertaining directly to the task, that produces motivation and satisfaction. Task assessments are presumed to be the proximal cause of intrinsic task motivation and satisfaction (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, pg. 668). They continue that the task assessments are viewed as interpretations or constructions of reality, rather than simple recordings of objective facts. Thus, intrinsic task motivation

(and subsequent behavior) is asserted to be influenced not solely by external events, but also by the way these events are construed (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, Pg. 669).

In their model, Thomas and Velthouse identify the cognitive components of intrinsic motivation, or task assessments, to be impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice. Like Thomas and Velthouse, Thomas and Tymon use the concept of task assessments as the foundation for their model. However, based upon the results of their empirical work, the task assessment impact was reinterpreted as progress. Consequently, the Thomas and Tymon model identifies the four task assessments of empowerment as choice, competence, progress, and meaningfulness (Figure 4). In addition, Thomas and Tymon are more explicit about the positive emotion, which accompany these assessments and serve as intrinsic rewards. Thus, the task assessments are called the four "feelings" of empowerment. The four feelings of empowerment are defined as follows:

	Sense of Opportunity	Sense of Accomplishment
Task Activities	Feelings of CHOICE	Feelings of COMPETENCE
Task Purpose	Feelings of MEANINGFULNESS	Feelings of PROGRESS

Figure 4. The Four Feelings of Empowerment

Thomas and Tymon Model

CHOICE is the opportunity you feel to select task activities that make sense to you and to perform them in ways that seem appropriate. The feeling of choice is the feeling of being free to choose, of being able to use your own judgement and act out your own understanding of the task.

COMPETENCE is the accomplishment you feel in skillfully performing task activities you have chosen. The feeling of competence involves the sense that you are doing well, quality work on a task.

MEANINGFULNESS is the opportunity you feel to pursue a worthy task purpose. The feeling of meaningfulness is the feeling that you are on a path that is worth your time and energy that you are on a valuable mission that your purpose matters in the larger scheme of things.

PROGRESS is the accomplishment you feel in achieving the task purpose. The feeling of progress involves the sense that the task is moving forward, that your activities are really accomplishing something (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

These feelings, the authors explain, stem from “both the task activities (behaviors) you perform and the task purpose (goal or mission) you are trying to achieve” (Thomas & Tymon, 1993, pg. 8).

The Thomas and Tymon Model - Specific

Unlike the general models of empowerment described earlier, the Thomas and Tymon model does not stop with the establishment of a sound conceptual foundation. In fact, their model provides the reader with a much more definitive list of actions than the specific models of empowerment. The authors identify the key elements that increase each of the four feelings of empowerment. These elements are called building blocks. For each building block, the model identifies two distinct types of actions. First, it lists specific actions a manager can take to empower their employees; these are labeled team actions. Second, the authors provide a set of actions that the individual can take to empower them; these are called personal actions.

To illustrate the practicality of the Thomas and Tymon model, a few of the more prominent building blocks and corresponding team actions for each of the four feelings of empowerment are outlined below.

Building Feelings of Choice

Thomas and Tymon contend that establishing the building blocks of trust and security in the work placing them space to exercise it enhances feelings of choice. The establishment of trust both up and down the chain of command as the crue1 of empowerment and the cornerstone of Total Quality Leadership (Thomas and Tymon (1993, pg. 11).

Building the Feelings of Competence

Once the employee chooses a tack and begins work, the proactive manager takes every opportunity to reinforce this behavior, fostering in that individual the feeling that they are doing a good job. Thomas and Tymon provide several building blocks to assist in that effort, including positive feedback and growth opportunities (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

The authors contend that positive feedback is the key ingredient for enhancing feelings of competence in the work force. Managers can tap into this positive energy source by giving members feedback that is more “appreciative” (positive) than “deficiency-Focused” (negative) helping them build on what they do well, rather than highlighting mistakes and shortcomings (Thomas & Tymon, 1993, pg.12).

Building Feelings of Meaningfulness

Thomas and Tymon place equal emphasis on the two distinct facets of a “task”, stressing the importance of both task activities and task purpose. Central to the notion of purpose is the feeling of meaningfulness, the sense that one is on a valuable mission in the pursuit of a higher cause. Many authors assert that the most important difference that good leadership makes in an organization is the

fostering of this sense of mission through the creation and communication of an exciting vision (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Peters, 1987).

According to the Thomas and Tymon model, developing an exciting vision of the future that the team wants to create, and (showing) how it would add value to the world” are powerful tools for managers to use when increasing feelings of meaningfulness in there employees (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

Building Feelings of Progress

Once managers establish the importance of the task purpose or mission, it is imperative that they continue to provide feedback to the work force concerning their progress in achieving that purpose. According to the model, one way of enhancing this sense of progress is by promoting a feeling of continuous improvement. By including continuous improvement as a building block for enhancing feelings of progress in the organization, the authors touch on one powerful aspect of the role of empowerment in a total quality setting.

As stated earlier the central feature of TQL is continuous process improvement. However, if TQL is to be effective as a management philosophy, continuous improvement must be more than just a buzzword. In fact, the notion of continuous improvement impacts on two facets of the organization the physical and the psychological. From a total quality standpoint, continuous improvement is a physical entity, representing the action taken by the work force to increase the efficiency, responsiveness, flexibility, etc., of the processes or systems of which they are a part. On the other hand, from an empowering perspective it is the feeling of continuous improvement that serves as a powerful employee motivator, rewarding workers for the successes of past efforts and encouraging them to use their creative energies to improve the system.

Procedures:

The author conducted all research and interviews. Some of the limiting factors was the difficulty to ask technical questions, such as whether or not adequate training as been received. Additionally, the students at the National Fire Academy are on a strict time clock and may not have had the reference material necessary to answer some of the questions.

While most of the information for this research project was gathered through literature review, this can be time consuming and with only six months complete the paper, more time could of resulted in more information thereby enhancing the quality of the work.

Results:

This paper has established the importance of intrinsic motivation in a total quality effort and revealed the lack of guidance provided by the quality experts on the subject. Based on the research, it is concluded that including the Thomas and Tymon model of empowerment in future fire service instructional packages regarding total quality can bridge the motivation gap in TQL theory and training. This addition should be in the format of a distinct program or module on the subject of employee empowerment and motivation (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

Discussion:

Total Quality Leadership

This research established the importance of the fire service's total quality initiatives in the face of declining budgets and increasing missions. These initiatives are based largely on the writings of W. Edwards Deming and are incorporated in a new management philosophy called Total Quality Leadership (TQL). It was concluded that the central feature of TQL is continuous process

improvement: a systems approach to quality management that features the inputs of those employees that actually do the work.

Empowerment

The establishment of an empowered work force is an essential step in harnessing the creative energy of the line-workers for continuous improvement. This paper defined empowerment in terms of two interrelated, yet distinctly different, sets of interventions. In essence, empowerment involves those interventions taken in the organization to increase employee participation and power. However, the term also encompasses the motivational effects these actions have on the work force. Emphasis is often placed on the structural changes made in an organization to move the decision-making authority down to the employees. Examples of this type of empowering interventions include delegation of authority, job design characteristics, and work teams. These tangible changes in the organization's power structure are labeled the mechanistic interventions or empowerment. The paper concluded that the mechanistic view of empowerment is most frequently discussed in management literature, including total quality literature, and includes specific actions to increase employee participation and power in an organization.

The other aspect of empowerment involves the psychological or energizing effects these structural changes have on the work force; these psychological interventions deal with empowerment in terms of intrinsic motivation. It was concluded that the motivational heart of empowerment is intrinsic task activation that was defined as positively valued experiences that individuals derive directly from a task (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

Role of Empowerment in a Total Quality Setting

This paper concluded that the mechanistic interventions of empowerment are largely addressed within the philosophy of TQM through the establishment of Quality Management Boards, Process Action

Teams, etc. However, TQL does not provide managers with a vehicle for managing the feelings of an empowered work force or for generating the kind of energy necessary to fuel the continuous improvement effort. Consequently, it was concluded that empowerment as intrinsic motivation provides the energy necessary for success in a quality effort, while TQL provides a way of harnessing this energy for continuous improvement.

Additionally, the research addressed the role that the non-structural empowerment interventions play in ensuring the long-term success of a total quality effort. This concludes that to be successful in the long run, managers in a total quality environment must employ more than just the mechanistic interventions of empowerment; they must also employ other types of actions to effectively manage the intrinsic motivation (energy) of the work force.

Quality Experts on Motivation

The importance of intrinsic motivation in a total quality effort is confirmed in the writings of the quality experts. Deming in particular emphasizes the role of intrinsic motivation, referring to it as a worker's "Pride of workmanship" or "Joy in Work." Deming believes that all workers are inherently motivated to do quality work; management need only remove the "barriers" to intrinsic motivation, such as performance reviews and production quotas, and good things will happen in the work place. Despite this unanimity as to the importance of intrinsic motivation in a total quality setting, none of the experts provide the typical line manager with practical guidance on how to enhance or manage it in his/her employees. This omission constitutes the "motivation gap" in TQL theory and training. Consequently, it was concluded that while the quality experts agree on the importance of intrinsic motivation and involvement in a total quality effort, they do not address specifically how to achieve or nurture it in the work place.

Alternative Models of Empowerment

Once the research established the crucial role that empowerment as intrinsic motivation plays in a total quality effort and revealed the lack of guidance from the quality experts on how to achieve it in the work force. The next step was to examine the alternative models of empowerment available in current literature to determine their usefulness in bridging the motivation gap in TQL theory. This paper divides these empowerment models into two distinct categories: general and specific.

Based on the research, it was concluded that, although conceptually strong, the “general” models of empowerment do not provide the typical line manager with the practical tools or direction necessary to empower their employees. Furthermore, it was concluded that, unlike the “general” models of empowerment, the “specific” models provide line managers with a detailed list of actions necessary to empower their employees. However, these models tend to be vague in their attempts to define the concepts behind the term empowerment and its motivational implications in the work place.

Finally, it was determined that what the line manager needs is a tool that combines the conceptual foundations of a "general" empowerment model with the detailed, practical directions of a “specific” model.

The Thomas and Tymon Model of Empowerment

Based upon the research conducted in conjunction with the drafting of this paper, it was concluded that the Thomas and Tymon model of empowerment is currently the best tool available to line managers for integrating a strong conceptual foundation with a practical set of action sequences. By grounding empowerment in terms of intrinsic motivation, this model also serves as a means for bridging the motivation gap in TQL theory and training by instructing managers on actions that can be taken to foster intrinsic motivation in the work force.

Recommendations:

This paper has established the importance of intrinsic motivation in a total quality effort and revealed the lack of guidance provided by the quality experts on the subject. Based on the research, it is concluded that including the Thomas and Tymon model of empowerment in future fire service instructional packages regarding total quality can bridge the motivation gap in TQL theory and training. This addition should be in the format of a distinct program or module on the subject of employee empowerment and motivation.

Reference List

Belasco, J., & Stayer, R. (1993). *Flight of the Buffalo: Soaring to Excellence, Learning to Let Employees Lead*. New York: Warner Books.

Bennis, W., and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategy for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper Collins.

Conger, J., and Kanungo, R. (1988). The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, pp. 471-482.

Deci, E. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Ewing, D. (1983). *Do It My Way or You're Fired*. New York: Wiley.

Fairfield, R. (1974). *Humanizing the Work Place*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Ford, R. (1969). *Motivation Through the Work Itself*. New York: American Management Association.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1977). *Management of Organizational Behavior, Utilizing Human Resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Juran, J., & Gryna, F. (1988). *Juran's Quality Control Handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lawler, E. (1969). Job, Design and Employee Motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 22, pp. 426-435.

Lawler, E. (1973). *Motivation in Work Organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks & Cole.

Lawler, E. (1988). Choosing an Involvement Strategy. *Academy of Management Executive*, 2, pp. 197-204.

Lawler, E. (1992). *The Ultimate Advantage, Creating the High Involvement Organization*. San Francisco, CA Jossey-Bass.

Lundy, J. (1991). *Lead, Follow, or Get Out of the Way*. New York: Berkley Books.

Marshall, R. (1987). *Unheard Voices*. Labor and Economic Policy in a Competitive World. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Bros.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence, Lessons from America's Best Run Companies*. New York: Harper & Row.

Pinder, C. (1984). *Work Motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott & Foresman.

Pyzdek, T. (1991). *What Every Manager Should Know about Quality*. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Rosen, C., Klein, K., & Young, K. (1986). *Employee Ownership in America*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Ryan, K., & Oestrich, D. (1991). *Driving Fear Out of the Work Place*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scherkenbach, W. (1991). *Deming's Road to Continual Improvement*. Knoxville, TN: SPC Press.

Senge, P. (1990). *Fifth Discipline: Mastering the Five Practices of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.

- Simmons, J., & Mares, W. (1985). *Working Together: Employee Participation in America*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Stariton, E. (1982). *Reality Centered People Management*. New York: Amacom.
- Tannenbaum, A. (1981). *Employee Ownership*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Taylor, F. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Townsend, P. (1986). *Commit to Quality*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Williams, E. (1976). *Participative Management Concepts, Theory, and Implementation*. Atlanta, GA: Publication Services Division, Georgia State University.